

REMARKS

Status Of Application

Claims 1-17 were pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 2, 3, and 7 are canceled.

Claims 1, 4, and 5 are allowed.

Claims 8-10, 13-15, and 17 are objected to.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,262,705 to Inoue et al. (hereinafter "Inoue").

Claims 11, 12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,043,798 to Yamamoto et al. (hereinafter "Yamamoto").

Drawings

To date, no Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review has been received. Applicants respectfully request receipt of this document when it becomes available. Please note that the original drawings filed in the patent application are "formal" drawings.

Claim Amendments

Claims 13-15 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. These amendments are not necessitated by the prior art, are unrelated to the patentability of the invention over the prior art, and do not introduce any new matter.

Allowable Subject Matter

The allowance of claims 1, 4, and 5, by the Examiner, is noted with appreciation.

The objection to claims 8-10, 13-15, and 17 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, is noted with appreciation.

Claims 8-10 and 17 depend from claims 6 and 16. As discussed below, claims 6 and 16 are deemed to be patentable over the cited references, and thus, claims 8-10 and 17 are also deemed to be patentable.

Claims 13-15 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to claims 8-10, 13-15, and 17 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Claim 6

The rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Inoue, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Inoue assertedly discloses a display device having a display comprising ferroelectric liquid crystals. (Inoue, Abstract.) Inoue also assertedly discloses the ability to “only the scan electrodes for the pixels to be written (rewritten) . . . in the partial writing (rewriting) of the screen without changing the other portion of the screen.” (Inoue, col. 7, lns. 45-48.) Inoue, however, fails to disclose a first driving method and a second driving method that are different from each other in that a waveform applied to a selected one of said scan electrodes of the first display area is different from a waveform applied to a selected one of said scan electrodes of the second display area as recited in Applicants’ claim 6.

Rather, Inoue simply discloses that the waveform is not applied when a portion of the screen is not changing. In fact, Inoue only discloses the use of a single waveform to write data to the display by applying the waveform only to the selected scan electrodes of the selected area of the display that is to be modified, i.e. when data is written to any line of the display in Inoue the same waveform is utilized. In other words, *it is the selected scan electrodes that differ, not the waveform.*

In contrast, the embodiment recited in Applicants' claim 6 recites a limitation that *a first and second display are driven by a first and second driving method, and that the first and second driving method apply a **different waveform** to selected scan electrodes.* This limitation is clearly not disclosed in Inoue.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Inoue, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 11, 12, and 16

The rejection of claims 11, 12, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamamoto, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claim 11 recites a limitation that the second display be a ***reflective type liquid crystal display***. In contrast, Yamamoto does not disclose the use of a reflective type liquid crystal display. Accordingly, Applicants' respectfully submit that Yamamoto fails to disclose Applicants' claim 11, and thus, claim 11 is considered to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 12 depends from and further limits independent claim 11 in a patentable sense and, for this reason and the reasons set forth above, is also deemed to be in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 16, the Office Action cites Yamamoto as fully disclosing the embodiment of Applicants' invention as recited in claim 16. In discussing the rejection,

however, the Office Action recites the elements of claim 11. Claim 16, which contains different limitations such as, for example, a second display stacked on the first display was not addressed by the Office Action. As stated by the MPEP:

An omnibus rejection of the claim “on the references and for the reasons of record” is stereotyped and usually not informative and should therefore be avoided. This is especially true where certain claims have been rejected on one ground and other claims on another ground.

A plurality of claims should never be grouped together in a common rejection, unless that rejection is equally applicable to all claims in the group.

MPEP 707.07(d), 8th Edition, August 2001.) (Emphasis added.)

In this case, reasons given in the Office Action regarding the rejection of claim 11 are not applicable to claim 16. Thus, the reasons for the rejection of claim 16 in the Office Action are unclear.

Nevertheless, the embodiment of Applicants’ invention recited in claim 16 recites limitations not found in Yamamoto. For example, Yamamoto fails to disclose, among other things, *a first display and a second display stacked on said first display* as recited in Applicants’ claim 16. Rather, Yamamoto only discloses a first and a second display, and is completely silent as to the possibility of stacking the second display on the first display. Additionally, Figures 9, 15, 17, and 22 of Yamamoto clearly illustrate the use of completely separate displays, not stacked displays.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 11, 12, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamamoto, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

This Amendment increases the number of independent claims by 3 from 4 to 7, does not increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, a Response Transmittal and Fee Authorization form authorizing the amount of \$252.00 to be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260 is enclosed herewith in duplicate. However, if the Response Transmittal and Fee Authorization form is missing, insufficient, or otherwise inadequate, or if a fee, other than the issue fee, is required during the pendency of this application, please charge such fee to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

Any fee required by this document other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee,

Serial No. 09/537,773

and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's
Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Mark A. Dodd
Mark A. Dodd
Reg. No. 45,729
Agent for Applicants

MAD/RCK:pm:jkk
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Direct: (214) 981-3481
Main: (214) 981-3300
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400
January 7, 2003

APPENDIX

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

The following is a marked-up version of the changes to the claims which are being made in the attached response to the Office Action dated September 24, 2002.

IN THE CLAIMS:

13. (Twice Amended) An information display apparatus [according to claim 11,] comprising:

a first display which displays an image by using a first displaying method; and
a second display which displays an image by using a second displaying method,
said second display being a reflective type liquid crystal display and being capable of
keeping the image thereon without consuming electric power;

wherein the first display is of a different type from said second display; and
wherein said second display has a liquid crystal material which exhibits a
cholesteric phase at a room temperature.

14. (Twice Amended) An information display apparatus [according to claim 11,] comprising:

a first display which displays an image by using a first displaying method; and
a second display which displays an image by using a second displaying method,
said second display being a reflective type liquid crystal display and being capable of
keeping the image thereon without consuming electric power;

wherein the first display is of a different type from said second display; and
wherein said first display and said second display overlap each other.

15. (Twice Amended) An information display apparatus [according to claim 11,] comprising:

a first display which displays an image by using a first displaying method; and
a second display which displays an image by using a second displaying method,

said second display being a reflective type liquid crystal display and being capable of keeping the image thereon without consuming electric power;

wherein the first display is of a different type from said second display; and

wherein said first display is detachable from said information display apparatus.

17. (Once Amended) An image forming apparatus according to claim 16, wherein said first display and said second display are respectively for [display] displaying a first color and a second color that is different from the first color.